

opinion of this. I do not agree with Steve Achelpohl, who...who is the attorney Senator Wickersham does agree with. And so it comes down to a vote here on whether you will want to go ahead after you have been fully advised by Mr. Clatterbuck, who was brought in as a pension law expert, not to go ahead with something like this, if we go ahead and ignore that advice or in spite of that advice go ahead, or whether you will adhere to his advice and not vote for 343. Regardless of how you decide to vote, my amendment will say, if, if this goes forward, it will be an addition to the whereases in 343 that the Legislature has been advised by Special Assistant Attorney General Gary Clatterbuck that the lawsuit contemplated by this resolution will be expensive due to the scope of the issues involved and the inclusion of several hundred necessary parties, will likely fail to bring clarity and finality to the matter, and will create...may create more liability risks and unfavorable court rulings. My reasons for bringing this amendment forward is that I realize with Senator Wickersham and the other members of the committee on the resolution that there's a good chance that it will pass, and I wanted to make sure that for the record that all of the information that we received from Mr. Clatterbuck and the Attorney General's Office and all of the testimony that we got from the individuals who are involved, who are asking us not to go ahead with this, to please not go ahead with this, from all of those testimonies and all of that information and advice, that despite all of that we have gone ahead with it. I wanted to make sure that all of their advice and opinions and their pleadings were brought forth here when we were discussing this resolution, and that's why I introduced this amendment to the resolution to make sure that their concerns were addressed, that their advice was discussed on the floor, and that despite all of that concern and that good advice that we went ahead with 343. There are a lot of issues here that I think should be discussed. I know we're short on time. I know people are at the end of the session here and tired, we've put in a lot of late nights and it seems to be a very complicated issue that would probably, even for the Retirement Committee, and we've gone through the hearings and talked to a lot of these individuals, it is still something that is part of the larger context of the retirement programs. It has taken me two years to probably just get a very, a very glimmer of all the things that I need to, to understand these issues. But one thing that I do understand from going through all of these hearings and reading through all of this information and one thing I do feel is that, is that